

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Specification, Claims 1 and 7 amended, and Claims 25-29 added. Claim 1 is amended to clarify the structural arrangement of the recited features; Claim 7 is amended herein to include all of the features recited by originally-filed independent Claim 1 to be rewritten in independent form; and support for Claims 25-29 can be found in the originally-filed Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Specification

The Specification is amended herein merely for cosmetic purposes, i.e., to correct typographical errors therein, e.g., the presence of consecutive periods “. . .” and misspelling of the word “thrust,” and does not include or otherwise present new matter.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 Allowed

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the indication by the Examiner that Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are allowed.

Claims 7-24 Allowable

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the indication by the Examiner that Claims 7-24, although objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, i.e., Claim 1, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. As noted above, Claim 7 is amended herein to include all of the features recited by originally-filed independent Claim 1 to be rewritten in independent form, thereby placing Claim 7 in condition for allowance. Claims 8-24

depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 7 and are also believed to be in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1, 4 and 25-29 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,674,452 to Asanomi. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Pending Claim 1 recites an engine including, among other features, the driven gear is disposed on the auxiliary device drive shaft. Claim 28 recites an engine including, among other features, the auxiliary device drive shaft is in a meshing arrangement with the first camshaft. Asanomi does not disclose or suggest such features since a) (with respect to Claim 1) the gears (21, 22, 23, and 24) are not disposed on the shaft of the auxiliary device, i.e., idler (16) as the idler (16) is provided between timing pulleys (12 and 13) that guide the timing belt (15) along the cylinder banks (see column 3, lines 16-18 of Asanomi); and b) (with respect to Claim 28) the auxiliary device, i.e., idler (16), is not in meshing engagement with any of the camshafts (10A, 10B, 11a, or 11b).

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Asanomi does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by pending Claims 1 and 28. Therefore, Asanomi does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter recited by independent Claims 1 and 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit independent Claims 1 and 28 should be deemed allowable over Asanomi.

Claims 4 and 25-26 depend from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit Claims 4 and 25-26 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable over Asanomi for at

least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,181,485 to Hirose et al. ("Hirose"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, Claim 1 recites an engine including, among other features, the driven gear is disposed on auxiliary device drive shaft. Hirose, like Asanomi, does not disclose or suggest such a feature as the shafts of idle pulleys (11a-11d) are not in meshing engagement with either one of the camshafts (5 and 6).

Applicants further note that Hirose fails to teach or suggest a thrust generated in the camshaft on which the drive gear is provided by virtue of the meshing engagement of the drive gear and the driven gear disposed on the auxiliary device drive shaft as is recited by Claim 4.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Hirose does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by pending Claims 1 and 4. Therefore, Hirose does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter recited by independent Claims 1 and dependent 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits independent Claim 1 and dependent 4 should be deemed allowable over Hirose.

Claims 25-26 also depend from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit Claims 25-26 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable over Hirose for at least

the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asanomi in view of Japanese Patent No. 2000002234 to Makihara. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Asanomi is discussed above. Makihara does not overcome the above-described drawback of Asanomi as Makihara does not teach or suggest a thrust generated in the camshaft on which the drive gear is provided by virtue of the meshing engagement of the drive gear and the driven gear disposed on the auxiliary device drive shaft. As such, because Asanomi and Makihara, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a thrust generated in the camshaft on which the drive gear is provided by virtue of the meshing engagement of the drive gear and the driven gear disposed on the auxiliary device drive shaft, Applicants respectfully submit Asanomi and Makihara do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the invention recited by Claim 4, let alone Claim 1, as is required by M.P.E.P. §2143.03 to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a rejected claim. As such, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 4 is not rendered obvious by Asanomi and Makihara for the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request Claim 4 be deemed allowable over Asanomi and Makihara and the rejection withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejections, allowance of Claims 1-29, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107355-00080.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Enclosures: Extra Claims Transmittal
Petition for Extension of Time (1 month)

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM:MO/elp